THE HONOUABLE SRI JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

W.P. No. 6041 of 2006

Date:06-07-2007

Between:

G.Sudarshan Reddy .. **PETITIONER**

AND

The Union of India rep. By its Secretary, Ministry of Petroleum,New Delhi and two others. **.. RESPONDENTS**

-

-

ORDER:

None appears for the petitioner in spite of posting the matter under the caption “for dismissal”.

Heard the learned counsel for the respondents 1 and 2.

The only grievance of the petitioner is that he is resident of Vinjamur village and mandal and he is qualified to be appointed as a retail dealer for the sale of petroleum products by the second respondent.

The perusal of the counter filed by the second respondent goes to show that the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited had set up a company owned company operated (COCO) outlet at Vinjamur in Nellore District, having obtained the site on lease from one Sri D.Krishna Murthy for a period of 30 years and was developed with substantial investment which was commissioned during January, 2004. Initiallly one Sri K.V.Sudhakara Rao was engaged as the contractor to provide required labour for operation of this outlet for a period of one year under contract agreement dated 02.02.2004 with an option for a further renewal for a period of one year. It is stated that the third respondent was selected for the award of the retail outlet dealership at Podalkur under the reservation category of scheduled caste (women) and a letter of intent for the said location was issued to her on 17.09.2004. It is stated that as per the guidelines viz. the Corpus Fund Scheme, the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited is required to procure the site and develop the outlet thereupon and hand over the same to the dealer and it is open for the respondent-Corporation to select under SC(W) reservation category and therefore, it cannot be said there is any illegality in the action of the Corporation.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that as per the guidelines issued by the Corporation, the action of the second respondent in allotting the petroleum outlet dealership at Vinjamur to the third respondent is in accordance with procedural norms. Therefore, I do not see any infirmity or irregularity in allotting the petroleum outlet dealership to the third respondent and therefore, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

_____

V.ESWARAIAH, J.

Date:06.07.2007
CCM